

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: C130/136 regression analysis.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 04, 2011 8:19 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** C130/136 regression analysis

Do you know when it will be ready?

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: 20 at benchmark...msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2011 5:22 PM  
**To:** Ryan Downton; Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** 20 at benchmark..  
**Attachments:** Odessa in 23.zip

run this and see if it is 10 out of 10

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: Having probs w borrowed bkberry did u get my emails from last nite..msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 7:43 AM  
**To:** Smith, CLS  
**Cc:** Ryan Downton; Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: Having probs w borrowed bkberry did u get my emails from last nite.

Lamar is working on a borrowed blackberry and his email to us didn't go through yesterday afternoon.

Lamar would like Bexar pct 4008, (465 people); it's in CD 35 in Plan C136. It's the SA Country Club adjacent to SJS's house. Giving it to lamar should help improve ssvr a fraction in CD 35. You will also have to give pct 4101 to CD 21 as well because it would be orphaned (357 people).

On Jun 8, 2011, at 7:25 AM, Smith, CLS wrote:

>

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: Having probs w borrowed bkberry did u get my emails from last nite..msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Ryan Downton [rdownton1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 7:46 AM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Cc:** Gerardo Interiano; Ryan Downton; Smith, CLS  
**Subject:** Re: Having probs w borrowed bkberry did u get my emails from last nite.

Ok - I'll work on it

On Jun 8, 2011 7:42 AM, "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:

Lamar is working on a borrowed blackberry and his email to us didn't go through yesterday afternoon.

Lamar would like Bexar pct 4008, (465 people); it's in CD 35 in Plan C136. It's the SA Country Club adjacent to SJS's house. Giving it to lamar should help improve ssvr a fraction in CD 35. You will also have to give pct 4101 to CD 21 as well because it would be orphaned (357 people).

On Jun 8, 2011, at 7:25 AM, Smith, CLS wrote:

>

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: Having probs w borrowed bkberry did u get my emails from last nite..msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Ryan Downton [rdownton1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 8:14 AM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Cc:** Gerardo Interiano; Ryan Downton; Smith, CLS  
**Subject:** Re: Having probs w borrowed bkberry did u get my emails from last nite.

Change has been made.

On Wed, Jun 8, 2011 at 7:45 AM, Ryan Downton <[rdownton1@gmail.com](mailto:rdownton1@gmail.com)> wrote:

Ok - I'll work on it

On Jun 8, 2011 7:42 AM, "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:

Lamar is working on a borrowed blackberry and his email to us didn't go through yesterday afternoon.

Lamar would like Bexar pct 4008, (465 people); it's in CD 35 in Plan C136. It's the SA Country Club adjacent to SJS's house. Giving it to lamar should help improve ssvr a fraction in CD 35. You will also have to give pct 4101 to CD 21 as well because it would be orphaned (357 people).

On Jun 8, 2011, at 7:25 AM, Smith, CLS wrote:

>

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Fwd: Changes to CD 12.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 9:23 AM  
**To:** Ryan Downton; Gerardo Interiano  
**Cc:** CLS Smith  
**Subject:** Fwd: Changes to CD 12

Heads up.

Charlie Geren is going to offer an amendment to Plan C144 to put downtown Fort Worth back in the Fort Worth Congressional District rather than the Denton County Congressional district. Easy fix, you just have to keep the transit East of IH 35W and go under I 30.

EO

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Leffingwell, Matt" <[Matt.Leffingwell@mail.house.gov](mailto:Matt.Leffingwell@mail.house.gov)>  
**Date:** June 8, 2011 9:07:53 AM CDT  
**To:** "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Changes to CD 12

Our office that is located on 7th and Jones street in downtown Fort Worth was drawn out. There is no population there. We told Charlie Geren about this problem and he said he would work on this today but this has to be corrected.

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: C147-Madden Amendment.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 11:07 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano; Ryan Downton  
**Cc:** CLS Smith  
**Subject:** C147-Madden Amendment

FYI--

Congressman Sessions and Congressman Marchant will be opposing Rep. Madden's amendment C147 and will be contacting Rep. Branch and Chairman Solomons as well.

Have we been able to find out why Madden's offering it? The explanation of keeping counties/cities/precincts whole doesn't mesh with what the amendment does.

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: C147-Madden Amendment.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 11:22 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano; Ryan Downton  
**Subject:** C147-Madden Amendment

Guys--

Just heard from Cong. Session's staff that he spoke with Rep. Madden and is now fine with C147. Cong. Johnson is as well. Cong. Marchant remains opposed.

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: C147-Madden Amendment.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Ryan Downton [rdownton1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 11:28 AM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Cc:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: C147-Madden Amendment

Is there an amendment to the amendment that we can do to get Marchant on board?

On Wed, Jun 8, 2011 at 11:22 AM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
Guys--

Just heard from Cong. Session's staff that he spoke with Rep. Madden and is now fine with C147. Cong. Johnson is as well. Cong. Marchant remains opposed.

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: C147-Madden Amendment.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 11:33 AM  
**To:** Ryan Downton  
**Cc:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: C147-Madden Amendment

You'll have to talk to him about that; his word to me was don't touch my district. So if you have an amendment which only affects Collin County, then yes, you probably will get him on board.

EO

On Jun 8, 2011, at 11:28 AM, Ryan Downton wrote:

Is there an amendment to the amendment that we can do to get Marchant on board?

On Wed, Jun 8, 2011 at 11:22 AM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
Guys--

Just heard from Cong. Session's staff that he spoke with Rep. Madden and is now fine with C147. Cong. Johnson is as well. Cong. Marchant remains opposed.

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Untitled attachment 00843.htm

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

On Jun 8, 2011, at 3:48 PM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

need you to resend me this file as a .txt. or .csv.

On Tue, Jun 7, 2011 at 5:21 PM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopielab.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopielab.com)> wrote:  
run this and see if it is 10 out of 10

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: 20 at benchmark...msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 4:30 PM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Subject:** Re: 20 at benchmark..

call me at work 512-463-0697

On Wed, Jun 8, 2011 at 3:59 PM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:

On Jun 8, 2011, at 3:48 PM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

need you to resend me this file as a .txt. or .csv.

On Tue, Jun 7, 2011 at 5:21 PM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
run this and see if it is 10 out of 10

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Fwd: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 4:54 PM  
**To:** Ryan Downton; Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Fwd: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell

So I presume there will be an amendment to the amendment limiting the changes to Collin County?

EO

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [marchantken@gmail.com](mailto:marchantken@gmail.com)  
**Date:** June 8, 2011 4:40:43 PM CDT  
**To:** "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell  
**Reply-To:** [marchantken@gmail.com](mailto:marchantken@gmail.com)

Thanks. I have just talked to them. They leaving me out of the ammendment. Thanks again.

-----Original Message-----

From: Eric Opiela  
To: Kenny Marchant  
Subject: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell  
Sent: Jun 8, 2011 4:49 PM

He just called asking why you were not okay with his amendment. I gave him your cell and asked him to call you.

EO

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on  
your cell.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Ryan Downton [rdownton1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2011 5:15 PM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Cc:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell

yes

On Wed, Jun 8, 2011 at 4:54 PM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
So I presume there will be an amendment to the amendment limiting the changes to Collin County?

EO

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [marchantken@gmail.com](mailto:marchantken@gmail.com)  
**Date:** June 8, 2011 4:40:43 PM CDT  
**To:** "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell  
**Reply-To:** [marchantken@gmail.com](mailto:marchantken@gmail.com)

Thanks. I have just talked to them. They leaving me out of the ammendment. Thanks again.

-----Original Message-----

From: Eric Opiela  
To: Kenny Marchant  
Subject: Mad Dog Madden is calling you on your cell  
Sent: Jun 8, 2011 4:49 PM

He just called asking why you were not okay with his amendment. I gave him your cell and asked him to call you.

EO

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Fwd: 9 Jun 11.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Corbin Casteel [wccasteel@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 10, 2011 10:35 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Fwd: 9 Jun 11  
**Attachments:** 9Jun11.zip; Untitled attachment 01092.htm

any truth to this part?

"If DOJ objects, the Texas federal court grants legislative deference to the map passed by the Legislature and is required to remedy ALL of DOJ's objections in its map. If preclearance is only pursued at DOJ there will be, most likely, a longer list of objections.

If Texas foregoes DOJ preclearance and litigation is not completed in the DCDC, the Texas three-judge panel cannot use the legislatively-enacted map and would be required to begin from the 2003 map as if this were a deadlock case."

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Dub Maines <[dubmaines@gmail.com](mailto:dubmaines@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** June 9, 2011 5:39:29 PM CDT  
**To:** Dub Maines <[dubmaines@gmail.com](mailto:dubmaines@gmail.com)>  
**Bcc:** [wcc@casteelincl.com](mailto:wcc@casteelincl.com)  
**Subject:** Re: 9 Jun 11

I would like add a correction that I received on the message that I sent earlier:

"If DOJ objects, the Texas federal court grants legislative deference to the map passed by the Legislature and is required to remedy ALL of DOJ's objections in its map. If preclearance is only pursued at DOJ there will be, most likely, a longer list of objections.

If Texas foregoes DOJ preclearance and litigation is not completed in the DCDC, the Texas three-judge panel cannot use the legislatively-enacted map and would be required to begin from the 2003 map as if this were a deadlock case."

And another:

"DOJ's punch list will grow exponentially if they know we have to make changes. Little things that they wouldn't have nit picked in a clean map will show up on the list because of the obvious retrogression and lack of new Hispanic seat."

That having been said, is there any reason why every effort should not be made to make the map more likely to pre-clear, especially if it doesn't hurt the political aims in any way?

On Thu, Jun 9, 2011 at 1:15 PM, Dub Maines <[dubmaines@gmail.com](mailto:dubmaines@gmail.com)> wrote:

I would really appreciate you looking at this modified Solomons/Seliger map. It is 26R and 10D, as is the one the House Committee

just passed. However, the Committee-passed map badly retrogresses CD20 without creating a new VRA district. CD35 is in no way a VRA district; it is a district that re-elects Congressman Doggett - whether he receives the support of Hispanic voters or not.

In the map I've sent you, CD25 is a heavily-Republican, Hill Country, West Texas district. CD20, contains the southeast quadrant of Travis County, has incumbent Congressman Charlie Gonzales in it, is heavily Bexar

County, and is a legal, performing VRA district. CD35 is an open seat and is a district from southern and central Bexar County to Webb County. It is a legal, performing VRA district.

The Committee map, as passed, has next to no chance of pre-clearance - either by Justice or the DC circuit court. The map I've sent you has a very high probability of pre-clearing - at least in the DC court. This is the analysis of those who have practiced in the Voting Rights area - very successfully - for over 25 years. I would encourage you to speak with them about the Committee-passed map. They may be from evil DC, but they ARE the premier experts in this area, and I believe it would be prudent to entertain their thoughts on this map!

There seems to be quite a bit of confusion about Section 5 pre-clearance. Section 5 is not like Section 2, in that Section 2 deals with existing maps and makes minimal changes to those existing maps, if the courts feel changes are needed. Section 5 pre-clearance decides if a map ever really "exists." If a map is not pre-cleared, then it is as if nothing had ever been drawn. The courts will draw the map de novo as they did in 2001. Doggett will be re-elected. Canseco will not be. Farenthold will not be. They will likely split the baby on the 4 new seats. The Ds pick up a net of 4 seats. The Rs pick up a net of zero seats. This idea of challenging the Constitutionality of Section 5 is high-risk poker with no discernible positive return.

Again, I would appreciate you importing and looking at this map. Please call on me if you have any questions, comments, or suggestions.

Thank you,  
Dub Maines  
972-898-6796

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: hilderbran.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 12, 2011 9:26 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** hilderbran

Have it on good authority Dub Maines was the one who briefed up Hilderbran. He also approached two other reps who all turned him down re: offering his amendment.

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: optimized Friday's Plan.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 7:23 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Cc:** Ryan Downton  
**Subject:** optimized Friday's Plan  
**Attachments:** C149-CD23modoptoep-nomav.zip

Gentlemen-

This is the best I could do. Only 17,360 in Maverick for CD 23. 52.4% McCain. All other districts at benchmark. Probably could get rid of all of Maverick if did Ector, but right now only districts changed are 16, 23, 28, 20, 35, 15. 20 doesn't leave bexar county, and 35 doesn't leave Bexar in the south either. Quico has not yet seen/signed off on this, but could you please run the election performance on this one (in lieu of the non-Ector one I sent Friday).

Let's discuss this morning.

EO

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: C149-CD23modoptoep-nomav.zip?C149-CD23modoptoep-nomav.DCC

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

# Available Natively

DocExt: DCC

Name: C149-CD23modoptoep-nomav.zip?C149-  
CD23modoptoep-nomav.DCC

Size: 58 bytes

Comments: Available Natively

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: C149-CD23modoptoep-nomav.zip?C149-  
CD23modoptoep-nomav.txt

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

DOCUMENT INFO

# Available Natively

DocExt: txt

Name: C149-CD23modoptoep-nomav.zip?C149-  
CD23modoptoep-nomav.txt

Size: 21,249KB (21,758,802 bytes)

Comments: Available Natively

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: optimized Friday's Plan.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 8:01 AM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Subject:** Re: optimized Friday's Plan

When can you come down to the redistricting office?

On Mon, Jun 13, 2011 at 7:22 AM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
Gentlemen-

This is the best I could do. Only 17,360 in Maverick for CD 23. 52.4% McCain. All other districts at benchmark. Probably could get rid of all of Maverick if did Ector, but right now only districts changed are 16, 23, 28, 20, 35, 15. 20 doesn't leave bexar county, and 35 doesn't leave Bexar in the south either. Quico has not yet seen/signed off on this, but could you please run the election performance on this one (in lieu of the non-Ector one I sent Friday).

Let's discuss this morning.

EO

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: optimized Friday's Plan.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 8:04 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: optimized Friday's Plan

45 mins.

On Jun 13, 2011, at 8:00 AM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

When can you come down to the redistricting office?

On Mon, Jun 13, 2011 at 7:22 AM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
Gentlemen-

This is the best I could do. Only 17,360 in Maverick for CD 23. 52.4% McCain. All other districts at benchmark. Probably could get rid of all of Maverick if did Ector, but right now only districts changed are 16, 23, 28, 20, 35, 15. 20 doesn't leave bexar county, and 35 doesn't leave Bexar in the south either. Quico has not yet seen/signed off on this, but could you please run the election performance on this one (in lieu of the non-Ector one I sent Friday).

Let's discuss this morning.

EO

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: optimized Friday's Plan.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 8:08 AM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Subject:** Re: optimized Friday's Plan

Sounds good...I'm uploading it right now...see you here.

On Mon, Jun 13, 2011 at 8:03 AM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
45 mins.

On Jun 13, 2011, at 8:00 AM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

When can you come down to the redistricting office?

On Mon, Jun 13, 2011 at 7:22 AM, Eric Opiela <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)> wrote:  
Gentlemen-

This is the best I could do. Only 17,360 in Maverick for CD 23. 52.4% McCain. All other districts at benchmark. Probably could get rid of all of Maverick if did Ector, but right now only districts changed are 16, 23, 28, 20, 35, 15. 20 doesn't leave bexar county, and 35 doesn't leave Bexar in the south either. Quico has not yet seen/signed off on this, but could you please run the election performance on this one (in lieu of the non-Ector one I sent Friday).

Let's discuss this morning.

EO

EO

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Map.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Gerardo Interiano [ginteriano@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 5:18 PM  
**To:** Eric Opiela  
**Subject:** Map  
**Attachments:** STRJC120.csv

Per your request.

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: STRJC120.csv

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

# Available Natively

DocExt: csv

Name: STRJC120.csv

Size: 18,898KB (19,350,609 bytes)

Comments: Available Natively

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: geren's amendment.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 10:04 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Cc:** Ryan Downton  
**Subject:** geren's amendment

did yall realize geren's amendment dropped granger by .66% to 55.01 McCain? that's a big drop for a district close to 55 already...of course, she requested it.

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: why.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 11:06 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** why

Why do this to me? I get the stats to benchmark in 20 and look at the report tonight and y'all dropped them to 55! Please, please say this whole exercise was not for naught. Call me crazy but I could care less about 35 being at 45--the thing will probably perform at 40, why not take that difference and attempt to meet it if we can? I calmed Lee, Holman, et. al. down today to have this done?

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Re: why.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2011 8:32 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** Re: why

No, just I think it's not good to not have all the stats at benchmark when we know its possible. Yes, I know CD 20's 10 of 10 performance and agree taking it below benchmark on SSVR can be justified by the creation of the new district. However, we know we can create the new district AND keep it at benchmark, so we should. Sure it performs the same, and will it make a difference in the end with the court, probably not; it just gives an easy paragraph where they can say we retrogressed, and we have to explain why it doesn't matter. That said, today's amendment is enormously better than C149, so let's just play ball. I do feel I was mislead into thinking y'all were going to keep all the districts at benchmark yesterday, and frankly, I used that argument to calm Lee and Chris Homan down when they were threatening to blow it all up. What is done is done.

Let's get this bill passed!

EO

On Jun 14, 2011, at 6:57 AM, Gerardo Interiano wrote:

> It's at 56.3....and it performs 10/10. You're looking at total when  
> you should be looking at non-suspense VR. Call me later this morning  
> if you want to talk further. Also, can you send me the analysis that  
> you did on all the amendments?  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Eric Opiela [<mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com>]  
> Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 11:06 PM  
> To: Gerardo Interiano  
> Subject: why  
>  
> Why do this to me? I get the stats to benchmark in 20 and look at the  
> report tonight and y'all dropped them to 55! Please, please say this  
> whole exercise was not for naught. Call me crazy but I could care  
> less about 35 being at 45--the thing will probably perform at 40, why  
> not take that difference and attempt to meet it if we can? I calmed Lee, Holman, et. al.  
> down today to have this done?  
>  
>  
>  
>

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: negatively affected members.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2011 12:31 PM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** negatively affected members

McCaul (dropped to 52.35 McCain)

Smith (dropped to 53.44 McCain, lost Hill Country) Canseco (dropped to 48.45 McCain, gets all of Maverick) Olson (dropped to 55.93 McCain) Conaway (loses 50% of Ector, Llano)

## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: Fwd: Pena Amendment.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

## DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:07 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Cc:** boopbruce@gmail.com; lamarsmith21@gmail.com camp  
**Subject:** Fwd: Pena Amendment

Pull the Pena amendment.

EO

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "[scott@cansecoforcongress.com](mailto:scott@cansecoforcongress.com)" <[scott@cansecoforcongress.com](mailto:scott@cansecoforcongress.com)>  
**Date:** June 15, 2011 9:03:51 AM CDT  
**To:** "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)>  
**Subject: Re: Pena Amendment**

Well if the numbers don't pan let's pull it. Probably not going to get 2/3rd anyway  
Scott Yeldell

----- Reply message -----

From: "Eric Opiela" <[eopiela@ericopiela.com](mailto:eopiela@ericopiela.com)>  
To: "[scott@cansecoforcongress.com](mailto:scott@cansecoforcongress.com) Yeldell" <[scott@cansecoforcongress.com](mailto:scott@cansecoforcongress.com)>  
Cc: "[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com) camp" <[lamarsmith21@gmail.com](mailto:lamarsmith21@gmail.com)>  
Subject: Pena Amendment  
Date: Wed, Jun 15, 2011 9:47 am

Scott,

I ran the numbers based on the actual election returns, comparing the Pena amendment configuration, vs. the C182 Engrossed configuration, and found the following:

The Pena change resulted in 186 less Republican votes for McCain (08) in CD 23.  
The Pena change resulted in 105 more Republican votes for Wainwright (08) in CD 23.  
The Pena change resulted in 58 less Republican votes for Perry (10) in CD 23.  
The Pena change resulted in 40 less Republican votes for Staples (10) in CD 23.  
The Pena change resulted in 130 less generic Republican congressional votes in 10 (a not-as reliable amalgamation of Republican congressional returns across 11, 16, 21, 23, and 28) in CD 23.

You would have to achieve around a 20% increase in turnout above the baseline turnout in order to overcome the decrease in performance, and that's to break even. Lamar is hesitant to make the change if it could actually result in either no improvement or a decline in performance for Quico.

EO



## DOCUMENT INFO

Filename: CD 15 R Primary.msg

FOLDER#: Straus072611\Outlook Data  
File\Straus\DIS

DOCUMENT INFO

---

**From:** Eric Opiela [eopiela@ericopiela.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:49 AM  
**To:** Gerardo Interiano  
**Subject:** CD 15 R Primary

County R primary totals:

Hidalgo (approx) 3,308  
Brooks 0  
Jim Hogg 15  
Duval 0  
Live Oak 887  
Karnes 547  
Wilson (approx) 1,157  
Guadalupe (approx) 10,036